



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

equipped with a general literary introduction, text, commentary, and metrical translation.

The introduction is chiefly concerned with the much argued, and as yet unsettled question of the attitude of Petronius toward Lucan. Doctor Baldwin quotes and discusses the many undoubted imitations of the *Pharsalia* that appear in the *Bellum Civile*, and reaches what seems to be a very sane conclusion. In her judgment the *Bellum Civile* is a literary *tour de force*, serving to demonstrate the author's ability to affect a style which he was far from approving. The theory that the poem is designed as a parody of the *Pharsalia* is scouted, on the ground that the most patent absurdities of Lucan have been ameliorated by his imitator, and that where exaggeration on the part of Petronius may be claimed the intent is apparently not humorous.

The text of this edition is eclectic, and differs in some important respects from that of Buecheler. The aim has been to produce a text that would read throughout, with a sparing use of actual emendation. In some cases the better reading has been displaced, as in line 29 *mutatur*, where Buecheler's reading *imitatur* makes the best of a bad situation. The emendation of Heinsius, *censum turbat*, admitted in line 30 of the same difficult passage, is not inevitable, although the resulting sense is good enough. On p. 89 of the Introduction, where section two of the *Satirae* is quoted, *declamationes continebantur* makes no possible sense.

The commentary is extensive, containing much illustrative material from writers on related topics, and many parallel passages of near or remote application. In matters of interpretation the notes are generally sound, though the sense proposed for line 21, *surripuere viros* seems far-fetched, and much more difficult than the commonly accepted meaning. The translation is a valuable addition to the commentary, since the author has achieved a smooth rendition in blank verse of good quality, and at the same time adhered closely to the original.

KEITH PRESTON

Notes on the Text of the Corpus Tibullianum. By MONROE E. DEUTSCH. *University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, Vol. II, No. 9, pp. 173-226. June 1, 1912.

This paper was presented in 1910 as a dissertation to the faculty of the University of California and is now printed in revised form. The author attempts, chiefly by conjecture, to throw light on a dozen passages of the *Corpus Tibullianum* among which are included some veritable *loci vexatissimi*. The dissertation is very clearly written and Dr. Deutsch shows himself well versed in the literature of his subject and in the method which promises the best results—the patient search for readings which satisfy the requirements of sense, style, and palaeography. And yet for reasons which are beyond the author's control results do not follow. The *Corpus Tibullianum*

is a seductive field for the would-be emendator because the more mechanical part of his task is comparatively very easy. There are recent and good texts, an *Index verborum*, an excellent summary of modern work (Cartault's *À propos du Corpus Tibullianum*), and finally the *Corpus* itself is so limited in extent that it is quite manageable. But in reality this last feature of the *Corpus* together with its well known simplicity of style places almost insuperable difficulties in the way of the emendator. The total amount of text is so small that it is often impossible to cite parallels for your conjecture from the text of the poet whom you are trying to "improve," and the style is so normal that it is even harder to prove that your conjecture is peculiarly Tibullian—to say nothing of Lygdamus, Sulpicia, and the rest. Thus the best type of support is usually lacking and parallels from Propertius, Ovid, etc., do not suffice to carry conviction. If Dr. Deutsch had applied his excellent method to the text of Plautus or Cicero, for example, his chances of success would have been far greater. But in the *Corpus Tibullianum* there is not room to maneuver and the only suggestion which attains more than possibility is the addition of *est* in i. 5. 76, "in liquida . . . aqua est." A few examples will suffice to indicate the baffling nature of the task.

In i. 2. 88 the reading proposed is "non *mi uni* saeviet usque deus," but the *Corpus* contains no parallel for the form *mi* and no case of the elision of such a contraction—indeed no good parallels for either point are cited even from contemporary poetry. In i. 5. 76, "in liquida *nam* tibi linter aqua est," no parallel for *nam* in the third position is cited from the *Corpus*, and the material collected (pp. 179–80) renders this an improbable position in Augustan poetry. For the phrase *per multa* (i. 6. 7, "illa quidem *per multa* negat"), which Dr. Deutsch considers Latin, he finds no good parallel anywhere. He admits that there are "no instances in Tibullus" of the construction "permisit *vina* . . . ut" (i. 9. 25), nor does he cite any from other sources. i. 10. 37 is read "illic (*parce!*) *ustisque* genis," but there is no support in Tibullus for the parenthetical insertion of *parce*, and none from any source for the phrase *ustae genae*. A similar dearth of the best support blights all the rest of the conjectures. Approximate analogies will convince nobody unless the conjecture be brilliant indeed.

The sophistical reasoning which marks some of Dr. Deutsch's arguments may be condoned as an indication of his enthusiasm, but it injures his work. Thus in i. 2. 88 he argues that *uni* is improbable because this substantive use occurs nowhere else in Tibullus, but in the same breath he supports *mi* (which also occurs nowhere else in Tibullus) from Horace, etc. Now *uni* can be just as effectively supported as *mi*—more effectively, in fact. Logically the emendator is entitled to use this sort of argument only when his own conjecture satisfies the sense better than another reading or is superior on other grounds. In this particular case Dr. Deutsch adopts all too hastily Golbéry's interpretation and thinks that *mi uni* is superior in sense. But if the phrase *non uni saeviet usque deus* is an erotic *sententia*, as seems probable,

then *uni* fits the sense perfectly. To penetrate the sense is especially necessary if one would understand Tibullus, as Lachmann long ago pointed out. Failure to work deeply into the sense is evident in the readings proposed, i. 9. 25; ii. 2. 17-22; ii. 4. 43, etc.

If the dissertation makes no real improvements in the text of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, we must look for its contribution to Tibullian scholarship in the by-products—such collections of material, for example, as those on the ellipsis of *esse* (pp. 181-82, 224-25), on *seu* and *sive* (p. 207)—and in the full, clear discussions of the passages examined. It is a useful piece of work to put into the hands of beginners in text criticism, not because it attains proved results, but because the author sees what points require proof and how the evidence is to be sought. The critique of the views of others is generally well grounded, although inability to consult Cartault's edition (1909) and the last edition of Schulze's *Römische Elegiker* (1910) has caused the author in a few cases to misrepresent these scholars.

Textual emendation is a fascinating exercise for all who have caught more than the surface meaning of a text, but it may be seriously questioned whether in general it is a proper field for writers of dissertations. The chances of adding anything worth while to the sum of human knowledge are very slight, and even seasoned scholars are too prone to rush their *alucinationes* into print. But whatever may be thought about the general question, at least the dissertationist should be warned off from such texts as the *Corpus Tibullianum*.

Ut tibi succedat vix semel esse potest.

ARTHUR L. WHEELER

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

Disputatio Critica de Carminibus Horatii Sex Quae Dicuntur Odae Romanae. By A. P. H. A. SLIJPEN. Amsterdam dissertation. Leyden: Théonville, 1912. Pp. viii+182.

A contribution to the extensive literature dealing with the first six Odes of Horace's third book can hardly be expected to offer very much that is new and at the same time plausible. Slijpen's book served as a dissertation, but was primarily written in a prize contest in which these Odes were assigned as the subject with the limitation that the opinions of scholars from Mommsen to Corssen (1889-97) be critically examined and the writer's own interpretation given. This work Slijpen has done well, and thus the book is useful as a summary of what has been written on the subject during the period covered. Its diffuseness however is objectionable.

Slijpen agrees with most scholars that the six poems form a cycle. He considers the phrase *virginibus puerisque* to be the underlying idea, though he does not press this point too hard. He thus rejects Mommsen's suggestion that the praise of Augustus is the chief motive, though he is willing to accept